

cancel 13

136. In a self-oscillating inverter powered from a source of DC voltage and operative to provide an AC voltage across a pair of output terminals, the modification comprising:

a series-combination of an inductor and a capacitor connected across the pair of output terminals, the series-combination having a natural resonance frequency;

gas discharge lamp means effectively connected in parallel with the capacitor; and

feedback means connected in circuit with the series-combination and operative to cause the inverter to self-oscillate at a frequency higher than the natural resonance frequency.

137. The modification of claim 136 wherein the feedback means comprises saturable inductor means operative, at least in part, to determine the frequency of the AC voltage.

138. In a self-oscillating inverter adapted to provide an AC voltage across a pair of output terminals, the modification comprising:

a series-combination of an inductor and a capacitor connected across the pair of output terminals, the series-combination having a natural resonance frequency;

gas discharge lamp means effectively connected in parallel with the capacitor; and

feedback means comprising saturable inductor means connected in circuit with the series-combination and operative to cause the inverter to self-oscillate at a frequency near the natural resonance frequency.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Examiner's attention is directed to papers #31 and #32 wherein Examiner indicated that the by-now-cancelled claims 124-128 would be allowable; which claims had previously been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 only.

The amended claims and the new claims are now largely directed to the subject matter represented by the cancelled claims 124-128, except for having been further limited such as, for instance, by including a gas discharge lamp means in each claim.

In considering the various claims in respect to obviousness, it is particularly important to keep in mind the very basic concepts expressed by Authorities #5, #7, #9 and #12 (see pages 3-4 of Appeal Brief). Also, it is important that it be possible at least to arrive at the claimed invention by way of some feasible combination of the applied references.

Moreover, in particular view to Authority #5, for a claim to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, it is necessary for Examiner to provide evidence to the effect that the problem for which the claimed invention represents a solution must have been apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Thus, as long as not directly anticipated in some timely reference, an invention representing a solution to a non-obvious problem, including a non-obvious use of an old "process", is definitely patentable, even if the solution provided by the invention may be obvious after the problem is enunciated.

Moreover, it is not enough for Examiner to simply assert that the problem is obvious. Rather, he has to provide evidence to the effect that the problem for which the claimed invention represents a solution was indeed apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

And, of course, this problem must be specific enough so as to require for its solution all the features of the claimed invention.

In view of the arguments and amendments provided hereinabove, Applicant now believes that all the claims are allowable over the cited art. However, if Examiner should reach a substantially different conclusion, he is asked to call Applicant on the telephone, thereby to attempt in an expeditious and cost-effective manner to arrive at a mutually satisfactory disposition of subject application.

Enclosed is a check for \$40.00 (#1071) to cover the fee for the additional claims.


Ole K. Nilssen, Pro Se Applicant

Date: 2-5-87